

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,423	BERG, ROBIN L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph C. Merek	3727	

All Participants:

(1) Joseph C. Merek.

(2) Steven Kelber.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1-73

Prior art documents discussed:

US 5,549,360 to Lipeles.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that upon consideration of the new reference to Lipeles that the claims to the rib would be canceled. It was also agreed that the non-elected process claims 49-56 would be canceled. It was also agreed that non-elected claims 57-72 would be canceled. It was also agreed that claim 73 would be canceled in view of claims 14 and 31 being in condition for allowance. Claims 14 and 31 recite that the rib in the shape of the hoop in combination with the tank where the rib is "y" shaped in cross section and the length of the trunk section of the rib taken along a central line from the distal end to the proximal end is greater than a width of the trunk. This is clearly shown in the elected embodiment of Fig. 5 as well as similar embodiments seen in Fig. 1-4 and 7. It was agreed that the term "toroid" in the claims would be replaced with hoop. The ribs are disclosed as being toroid shaped hoops in the specification. To be a true toroid shape the cross-section would have to be circular or elliptical and not that of a "y" shape. This was changed for clarity. It was also agreed that the term toroidal would be deleted from the specification and the abstract.